OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Effect of Modern Technology and Organization upon Social Behavior
Author(s): Hadley Cantril
Source: *Social Forces*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (May, 1937), pp. 493-495
Published by: Oxford University Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2571419
Accessed: 14/06/2014 06:56

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social Forces.*

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.216 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 06:56:08 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

example the case of the American college professor who likes to look and talk like a business man.

(2) What stereotypes does this occupation enforce regarding other groups? A lawyer or a professor has a whole set of prestige values picked out for him. The young psychologist, for instance, is supposed to admire physicists and physiologists and to look down upon sociologists and philosophers.

(3) What conflicting and coöperative relations exist between this group and other groups? Consider business men and government, army and navy, professors and trustees.

(4) What skills and doctrines are possessed by this group? Which of these are genuine techniques and which are aimed at defending vested interests, and at reconciling conflicts?

(5) What peculiar ethical rules are fostered by the group? Compare, for example, the ethics of actor and professor, of lawyer and banker.

XII. THE EFFECT OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION UPON SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

HADLEY CANTRIL

Princeton University

BEFORE we can adequately discuss the effect of modern technology and organization upon inter-individual behaviors, certain methodological points must be considered.

Social psychology, like any other field of psychology, has to deal in terms of individual interactions and the influences of situations on the individual. In Professor Allport's definition of social psychology, the emphasis on the study of individual behaviors tends to obscure the study of situations and of their effects on individuals. It seems necessary, therefore, to amend his definition with a single phrase at the end, to read: Social psychology may be defined as the study of the behavior (or awareness) of individuals in their reactions to other individuals or in social situations, the behaviors through which individuals stimulate one another in such situations, *and the influences of such situations on the individual*. These influences affect the individual either consciously or unconsciously.

This addition makes two factors more explicit. One of these is the influence of social situations *as such* on the individual. Social situations, like the well-known illusions of the laboratory, have their own configurations, their own structurations. We know from Professor Allport's earlier work that the individual acts differently alone than when in a group situation. To explain this change without regard to the way in which the two situations are perceived by the individual is to neglect basic psychological data. The effects of modern communicative devices cannot be understood, for example, unless the words and symbols in the total perceptual setting are analyzed. The radio, reading, or face-to-face situations all provide unique perceptual patterns that can be studied as such.

The second reason for our addition to the definition is the fact that what Dr. Sherif[1] has called a "social norm" may be generated in a social situation and provide the individual participant with a frame of reference that will affect his subsequent behavior even when he is away from the

[1] Muzafer Sherif, *The Psychology of Social Norms*. Harper's, 1936.

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.216 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 06:56:08 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

group. We know that once an individual has had contact with other individuals in a group, crowd, or institutional situation, he incorporates into his mental life new attitudes that influence him in later behavior. These new attitudes—often represented by a symbol—become for him realities. The social psychologist must accept these norms as realities if his discussion is to be social psychology and not epistemology or mathematics. This is not bringing to life the dead ghost of the group mind. Nor is it denying that social norms are dependent on individuals or overlooking the differences between individuals. It is simply stating that social norms—attitudes, customs, laws, historical products of all kinds—provide a level of description that will help make social psychology realistic. The social psychologist must accept reality on the level at which he finds it. For example, the technical device of printing brought not only clearer type but prestige suggestion and oftentimes the impression of universality and contemporaneity. For the individual reader one effect is just as "real" as another.

Such a modification of our definition also makes it necessary at the present time to modify the title of our assignment to carry the following meaning: "The effect of modern technology and organization upon inter-individual behaviors in the culture or cultures with which we are familiar." For the social psychologist as well as the man in the street has been affected by social situations and has definite frames of reference which determine the way in which he will discuss the effects of modern technology and organization or almost any other topic.

With these preliminary considerations in mind, we can take as examples of modern technology, the improved media of mass communication such as the newspaper, the radio, and the moving picture, and see how they have affected behavior in the society with which we are most familiar.

Most important and most obvious is their tendency to standardize life. With approximately 100,000,000 movie attendants per week, one billion hours of radio listening, and incalculable perusal of newspapers, habits, tastes, and attitudes are becoming more uniform, less individualistic. This depersonalization is, of course, the result of the breaking down of differences of all kinds—rural-urban discrepancies and the formerly glaring inequalities in the opportunity for social participation in education, politics, religion, news, entertainment, and the like. There is less demand on individual resourcefulness and initiative with the assumption of a somewhat more submissive attitude toward the tastes and norms imposed by the media.

The new communicative devices also make for greater social control. Standardization is in a direction tending to preserve the status quo since existent socio-economic attitudes are most naturally accepted by the directors of these media. With this standardization comes an over-simplification of issues—people accept the sides taken by the announcer or the correspondent, they become "for" or "against." The basic norms underlying the issues are seldom questioned. They are taken for granted, having become a part of "common sense." Least common denominators are sought and are followed by all but the sophisticated few or those who have become conscious of discrepancies between the norms represented by the media and other possible frames of reference. Under Fascism, where technology has been made the servant of a single, all-pervading attitude, we have the clearest example of the swift social control made possible by technology. An interesting

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.216 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 06:56:08 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

illustration of the effectiveness of modern devices of communication is seen in the strict ruling of Harlem's Father Divine that his followers shall not read any newspapers not printed by him, shall not go to the movies, and shall listen only to His radio programs. God, being a social psychologist, knows that he must rigidly control these media so that no outside norms will disturb the peace that reigns in his kingdoms.

A further effect of the improved media of communication is their use in accelerating social change in times when social norms are changing. Modern revolutionists, whether they are rebels, Bolsheviks, or Nazis, try to capture radio stations, newspapers, and telegraph lines first of all in any *putsch*. In this way they can insert new social norms when older ones have lost their rigid structure.

In conclusion it should be pointed out again that the delimitation of inter-individual behaviors—the standardization of life—is not necessarily the result of modern technology but the result of modern technology operating within a framework to which we are accustomed. The effects of technology depend largely upon who controls it and what social function it serves. It is not impossible that under a different organization a more personalistic variety of inter-individual behaviors could be fostered, if that is the desideratum. In Soviet Russia, for example, where technology serves a different rôle, the radio is helping to increase the variety and complexity of non-political tastes and interests by featuring highly specialized programs designed for particular small groups of individuals—such as bee-keepers, surgeons, electricians. The new leisure that could be created under technology might well extend and intensify inter-individual behavior.

We have failed to mention techniques of study and illustrative results in this brief survey because it seemed more profitable to use this topic as an excuse to emphasize two basic methodological points. First, that social psychology must study the actual characteristics or properties of the situations in which technology is found. This is usually overlooked in observations because the observer, being a part of the situation, lacks a vantage point. Second, that social psychology will find a description of many social phenomena in terms of social norms more realistic than a description in terms of individual behaviors. Therefore most of the phenomena with which social psychologists are concerned —including the effects of technology— cannot be considered without reference to social norms within which those phenomena appear.

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.216 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 06:56:08 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions